

MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS AND FACTORS OF RESILIENCE DURING THE EXTREME SITUATION

Jolita Gečienė

Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania, e-mail: geciene.j@mruni.eu

Received March 2020; Accepted April 2020

Abstract

The social changes taking place in today's world, the intensifying processes of globalization and the development of technological processes encourage organizations to take social responsibility and strengthen their social resilience. The recent question - why some organizations, which have experienced difficulties, crisis situations and adverse events, can overcome unforeseen difficulties, maintain structure and continue to function efficiently, while other organizations are unable to overcome the challenges, justifies the relevance of the article. Therefore The article discusses the factors of social resilience that affect the activities of organisations providing social services. It is revealed how these organisations can work effectively to strengthen social resistance when facing new challenges, difficulties, unfavourable business circumstances and crisis situations. It analyses the current difficulties faced by service organizations and identifies the key challenges that organizations face. It defines the concept of social resilience and identifies what factors of social resilience influence the management and performance of service organizations.

Purpose – The aim of the paper is to reveal the factors of social resilience of organizations that help to overcome challenges by presenting a theoretical model of the factors of influence of social resilience of organizations and empirically substantiating the factors of social resilience of organizations in service provision and management.

Design/methodology/approach – A qualitative exploratory study was conducted. The research method is structured interviewing. The results of the study are summarized in the table below.

Findings – Social resilience is the response to shocks, adapting to change to manage crisis effectively. The most important factors for resilience of organizations in coping with challenges and emergencies are: 1. Human resource management; 2. Standardized risk management procedures; 3. Strategic planning. The least important factors in resilience to emergencies are innovation and initiative and the development of technology and knowledge.

Research limitations/implications – The study was conducted in Lithuanian social services organizations. 5 managers of social services institutions - experts in their field were surveyed. Due to this limitation, research insights can only be viewed as subjective opinions of experts in one area.

Practical implications – the results of this study may be useful for social service institutions in coping with emergencies and improving the quality of their activities.

Originality/Value – The results of the survey can help service organizations cope with unanticipated changes and emergencies.

Keywords: management, resilience, emergency

Research type (choose one): viewpoint

JEL classification: Y1, Z13, Z39

Introduction

In today's society, the ongoing changes that are connected to decreasing population, ageing and the economic and management peculiarities, requires the public sector and service providers to take on a change for new challenges in terms of planning, decision-making, their implementation and management of all types of resources (Raipa and Petukienė, 2009). Organizational structures

are subject to shocks, such as a decline in social capital, loss of property rights, etc., and are also subject to sudden changes in social and economic policies, all of which have a profound impact on the ability of organizations to operate (Dawley, 2013). During their lifetime, service-providing organizations experience not only ups and downs, but also crisis situations, increased risk periods, and challenges that can influence the management of the organisation's capabilities and prospects by developing their social resilience (Coombs, 2010). Each organization is unique in its potential, problems, and only the characteristics of that organization (Abrams et al., (2015). Research has found (Barca et al., 2012) that organizational development solutions are influenced by internal environmental factors and external national and international social, economic and political changes. More and more, it is noticed that the theory of social resilience provides an insight into how regions and organizations facing disasters, tensions and major obstacles seek to achieve the desired results in terms of adaptation, coping and development (Acemoglu et al., 2014).

Exploration of the topic - social resistance of organizations (Norris, et al., 2008; Christopherson et al., 2010; Chandra et al., 2010; Martin and Sunley, 2013; Pike et al., 2010).

1. New challenges for institutions that provide services

Contemporary scientists and policy makers focus on measures to encourage older people to work longer. In fact, the constant challenge is to convert active ageing into a dynamic concept, creating a favourable environment for various subgroups of society, including weak and dependent members of society (Boudiny, 2013).

When organizing and providing services, especially for older people, it is necessary to evaluate that it is becoming a challenge and attention is heading towards the growing needs of the service users and the increasing costs of these services, while the state's ability to meet the needs of service users is rather limited and will likely only decrease in the future (Lukamskienė and Budėjienė (2013).

Another challenge for service providers is interinstitutional cooperation. According to Večkiene et al (2013), the main barrier to interdisciplinary collaboration is the diversity of approaches that prevent professionals from different institutions (e.g. health care professionals and social workers) from discovering common values that unite their activities.

Another challenge facing service providing institutions nowadays is deinstitutionalisation, a process that involves high-quality, personalized services in the community, including services to prevent institutionalization, planned closures of care institutions and access to basic services such as training and education, busyness, provision of housing and others, claim (European Expert Group, 2012). In 2009, group of independent experts identified three major challenges that hinder the reform of stationary care, while researching deinstitutionalisation processes:

a) Excessive investment in the existing system. Low care quality was primitively perceived as a result of poor material conditions, thus huge funds were invested in the buildings. Although the improvement of the physical environment contributes to a better quality of life for the people in care, it makes it very difficult for important systematic changes, as the authorities are not inclined to close the institutions where large sums of money are invested.

b) The existence of two different systems at the same time. Development of alternative services associated with the gradual closure of existing care facilities. If this does not happen, there is a risk that new community services will be provided in parallel with the old care facilities.

c) Too much of an “institutional” nature alternatives. Often the creation of alternatives includes care institutions themselves, with little attention paid to experts and the residents of the care institutions themselves, therefore insufficient attention is paid to individual needs and preferences (Genienė and Šumskienė, 2016).

Summarizing the challenges faced by service providing institutions, one can say that the main challenges are: increasing globalization processes, growing needs of service users, and insufficient interinstitutional cooperation, transition from institutional care to society care.

2. Social resilience factors that influence performance and management of organisations providing services

In service providing organisations, social resilience arises from dynamics and processes that are sufficiently flexible and are being formed so that organisations that could cope with unexpected situations (Magis, 2010). In scientific sources, the concept of social resilience is defined differently by different researchers. Luthar et al. (2000), notes that Resilience is a dynamic process of positive adaptation to significantly adverse circumstances. Rudolph and Repenning (2002), define resilience as maintaining a positive adjustment in difficult conditions (errors, crises, shocks, routine disruptions, constant risk, tension) by applying positive adjustment to make organisations that experience difficulties to become stronger and more inventive. Norris et al. (2008), notes that social resilience is the ability of organisations and other social systems to maintain the balance between various elements during an event of crisis, concentrating available resources and competences, ability to manage the needs, challenges and changes that are encountered. The ability to manage and strengthen the social resilience of organizations is often determined by competent, effective and empowering leaders (Zaccaro, 2007). Brown et al. (2017), point out that in the field of governance, leaders need to strike a balance between preventive control, attentive action, optimization of activities and adaptive innovation, consistent with the mission and vision of the organization, as one of the key roles in enhancing organizations' resilience is clear and shared vision creation. It is

therefore important that relevant stakeholders are involved and involved in decision-making organizations (Pal et al., 2014). Other research has found that organizational resilience requires sustained efforts, which depend not only on leaders, but also on employees (Lv et al., 2019).

Chandra et al. (2013), reveals that in order to overcome challenges, to cope with difficulties, crisis situations and to prevent unwanted events, it is necessary to distinguish the key elements of social resilience: social and economic justice; common prosperity; effective risk management; integration of state and non-governmental organisations and their communicative factors.

Scientific researches identify factors that contribute to social resilience as such:

a) Social partnership and networking help overcome the new challenges that have emerged when Lithuania became a member of the European Union. “Social partnership can be seen as an innovative way of overcoming economic, social and environmental challenges. High-quality social partnership promotes innovation and innovation brings unexpected results and quality of new solutions” (Kvieskienė and Kvieska, (2012);

b) Collaborative processes that help to accomplish changes (Wolfe, (2010);

c) Role of heads of organisations where the main protagonists are managers and leaders who can make changes in institutions (Bristow and Healey, 2013);

d) Conceptualized organisations that are involved in complex feedback interactions with other institutions, where changes and adaptability take place at different levels and with different speed potentials (Williams et al. (2013).

Boschma and Capone (2014), noted that regions can strengthen social resilience by: strengthening local resources or organizational skills; using own specialized knowledge base to diversify new related activities and connect to industry and technology from other regions or organisations from which they can link resources and unite those with a strong local knowledge base. Swanstrom (2008), argues that it is important to work with organizations in the region in the process of planning and implementing change, taking into account the limits of their existing constraints, creating new growth patterns to compensate for unwanted events and recession processes, strengthening social resilience in service organizations.

Summarizing the factors of social resilience that influence management and performance of organisations that provide services, it can be concluded that social resilience is a response to shocks: it is adaptation process and an action of overcoming undesirable situations in significantly adverse circumstances. Key factors contributing to social resilience are social partnership, collaboration and communication, and adequate behaviour of managers in adapting to change as well as other organizational resources available to the organisation with the purpose of effective crisis management.

3. Research methodology

In an emergency, a qualitative exploratory study was conducted to identify the challenges faced by social care organizations during turbulent times, using a structured interview method. The survey was attended by heads of social care institutions operating in Lithuania. 5 managers, experts of at least 5 years in their field, were selected for the survey. work experience - to accumulate knowledge in a variety of situations, changing environmental conditions, and managers with a master's degree - to provide knowledge and competencies in the field of social work and management. The survey was conducted in writing. Interview results were processed by logical analysis and synthesis. In order to determine which factors of organizational resilience are most important for social service organizations in coping with challenges and disadvantages, and to strengthen their resilience, the survey participants were asked three questions. The first question asked survey participants to identify what is important in an emergency during this time of crisis, in order to maintain the continuity of the organization and the successful operation of the organization. In the second question, respondents ranked the organisation's resilience factors by importance. In the third question, the interviewees justified their choice of why one factor is the most important and the other less important.

4. Research results and findings

Identifying what is important in this period of emergencies, in order to maintain the continuity of the organization and the successful operation of the organization, the subjective opinion revealed that it is very important to follow the resolutions of the Government of the Republic of in the office. The study participants state that it is important to provide the staff with all the necessary safeguards and quarantine conditions in order to ensure the success of their operations. Human resources management, performance of functions within the institution's competence, compliance with hygiene requirements, and implementation of preventive measures are all important to ensuring the organisation's resilience factors. The respondents also state that it is necessary to prepare an emergency plan in this situation, which clearly defines the functions of the persons responsible, the measures envisaged and the actions for the management of the crisis. The study participants state that it is very important to develop an emergency management plan, which clearly defines who is responsible for what in the institution, what measures are taken, detailed recommendations on how the employee should behave in case of an emergency, the plan should be constantly updated. It is also important to set up an on-site task force responsible for emergency management.

Based on the theoretical analysis of scientific sources and the results of Gečienė and Raišienė's (2019) empirical research, factors of influence of organizational resilience were

determined. In this study, the managers of the institutions were asked to rank the factors identified by the authors mentioned above, ranked first to eleventh, with ranked first as the most important factor for organizational resilience and rank 11 as the least important factor for organizational resilience during an emergency. After identifying which factors of organizational resilience are most important, the survey participants were asked to justify their choice. According to the survey, the reasons why some factors are very important and others less important, see. Table 1.

Table 1. Organizational resilience factors in order of importance

Place by importance	Factors of organizational resilience	Priority justification (survey quote)
1 – 3 places	Human Resource Management	"This would be a way for the institution to achieve the best possible results"; "In managing human resources, we align the goals of individual employees and the institution itself to achieve the best results and meet our goals"; "It is important that the organization has and maintains a staff retention policy to ensure that there is no shortage of qualified staff"; "Proper management of human resources enables the institution to achieve its goals, deliver effective results, manage contingencies, and strengthen teamwork."
	Standardized procedures for risk management	"An important factor, as these are pre-established procedures based on experience and statistics. It would be an opportunity to reduce the risk and manage it, control it "; "The sequence of activities of an institution to ensure the best possible result for the client in the prevailing circumstances"; "With the right tool, we can manage the crisis so that at least essential services are provided"; "It is very important to manage risks, especially in an emergency, unforeseen changes and so on. A standardized procedure avoids chaos, allows uncertainty to manage the situation properly and prevents crises"; "Standardized risk management procedures are important to prevent unpredictable situations"
	Strategic planning	"Emergency situations deal primarily with factors that are relevant to the current period of crisis, and objectives for future planning should move to less important factors"; "No effective work is possible without properly formulated goals"; "It is very important because it is resource planning, human resources, expected work, which allows to see further work in the social work field"; "By improving employee competencies, we increase employee motivation and improve the psychological climate in the organization" "It is very important to strategically plan the activities of the institution, in order to maintain stability, ensure systematic, planned and efficient work. Strategic planning links activities to the vision, mission and values of the organization, thus helping to achieve long-term goals. "

Table 1 continues on the next page

Place by importance	Factors of organization resilience	Priority justification (survey quote)
4 – 6 places	Financial stability	"Without financial stability, we would not be able to maintain the continuity and continuity of our services"; 'Access to all operational resources'; 'Being a financially sound institution can provide fanatic security to recipients and employees by improving the quality of the services provided'; "It is a very important factor both in the normal operation of the institution and in the event of an emergency. Financial stability must be ensured in order to manage the financial situation of the institution in a planned, efficient and purposeful manner. '
	Management of business continuity processes	"An important factor as the facility will be able to provide services during and after an emergency"; "It is less important in a time of crisis, because the person who focuses on the services comes first. In the event of an emergency, the physiological needs of the human beings must first be satisfied and the psychological minimum must be met in order for the recipients of services to survive this difficult period "; "Continuity management processes are designed to respond to an emergency situation within an institution, thereby minimizing critical consequences. Each institution is faced with unforeseen situations, and it is important to have business continuity plans in place to ensure safe business continuity. "
	Performance optimization and continuous improvement	"Structural changes are needed to expand the business, but they would not be the most important factors in an emergency, unless it is a necessity for the continuity and improvement of the business." "Focusing and keeping the situation as good as possible is important. Improving results is possible only by exploring new working methods and applying them in their working practices. "; "Office activities are and must be optimized to manage work efficiently and at minimum cost"; "Performance optimization and continuous improvement is the way to the future"
7 – 9 places	Cooperation	"Transfer of experience and dissemination, cooperation with social partners help to develop activities successfully, to reveal the specificity of the institution, to improve the quality of services provided, to share and exchange best practices by introducing advanced methods and new forms of organization of activities"; "It is important to share good work experience, to compare performance".
	Empowering Leadership	"It is the least important in this crisis because we do not have to show that we are superior and better than other institutions. It is now important not to compete, but to remain protected by the human resources available and to maintain constant cooperation with the social partners"; "It is important because when a manager empowers the employee, the employee feels equal, does not feel the gap between the supervisor and subordinates, and the employee feels respect and trust - in which case the performance is much better"; "Empowering leadership is the least important thing compared to everyone else."
	Improving knowledge and competences	"In an emergency, these factors are important but not key (employees could improve their knowledge and competences in their spare time)".

Table 1 continues on the next page

Place by importance	Factors of organization resilience	Priority justification (survey quote)
10-11 places	Innovation and proactivity	"The pursuit of innovation is an important factor, but proactivity can not only be a positive phenomenon as it can take time, affect human well-being, etc."; "This is not a major factor in this crisis, as it is not the core of social services, but an enhancement to the quality of social services."
	Technology development and knowledge development	"In a crisis situation, we enable employees to work remotely - we continue with the organization"; In the field of social services, the above-mentioned factors must first be met, then technology, knowledge and so on can be developed. "

Source: (author).

According to the research data, the most important factors of organizational resilience in emergency situations for social service institutions are human resource management, which enables to achieve effective performance, standardized risk management procedures - identified as a crisis management tool and strategic planning, plan the operation of the institution and maintain stability. Well, as the least important factors that are considered the least important in an emergency, innovation and proactivity are not only positive for social services in this time of crisis and technological and knowledge development, implementation can develop technology and knowledge.

5. Conclusions

Theoretically highlighting the social resilience factors of social service organizations, it can be concluded that social resilience is a response to shocks, adapting to change in order to effectively manage the crisis.

According to the results of the survey of managers of social services organizations, the most important factors of resilience of organizations in overcoming challenges and disadvantages are: 1. Management of human resources; 2. Standardized procedures for risk management; 3. Strategic planning. The least important factors for resilience in coping with an emergency are Innovation and Proactivity and Technology and Knowledge Development.

The results of this study may be useful for social service institutions in coping with emergencies and improving the quality of their activities.

References

Abrams, J., Davis E. J., Moseley K. (2015). Community- Based Organizations and Institutional Work in the Remote Rural West. RPR Review of Policy Research. The politics and policy science and technology. Vol. 32, No. 6. 675 – 698.

- Acemoglu, D., U. Akcigit and M. A. Celik (2014). Young, restless and creative: openness to disruption and creative innovations. Penn Institute for Economic Research Department of Economics University of Pennsylvania Vol. 14, No. 004. 1 – 58.
- Barca, F., McCann, P., Rodríguez- Pose, A. (2012). The case for regional development intervention: place- based versus place- neutral approaches. *Journal of regional science*, Vol. 52 No. 1. 134–152.
- Boschma, R., Capone, G. (2014). Relatedness, diversification and institutions. working paper,
- Boudiny, K. (2013). „Active ageing“: from empty rhetoric to effective policy tool. *Ageing and Society*, 33(6), 1077-1098.
- Bristow, G., Healey, A. (2013). Regional resilience: an agency perspective. *Journal Regional Studies* Vol. 48, No. 5. 923 – 935.
- Brown, Ch., Seville, E., Vargo, J. (2017). Measuring the organizational resilience of critical infrastructure providers: A New Zealand case study. *International Journal of Critical Infrastructure Protection*. Vol. 18. 37-49.
- Chandra, A.; Acosta, J.; Meredith, L. S., Sanches, K., Stern, S., Uscher-Pines, L., Williams, M., Yeung, D. (2010). Understanding Community Resilience in the Context of National Health Security. *Journal Rand Health Q* .Vol.1 , No. 6.
- Chandra, A.; Williams, M.; Plough, A., Stayton, A., Wells, K.B, Horta, M., Tang, J. (2013). Getting actionable about community resilience: the Los Angeles County Community Disaster Resilience Project. *American Journal of Public Health*. Vol. 103, No. 7. 1181–1189.
- Christopherson, S. Michie, J., Tyler, P. (2010). Regional resilience: theoretical and empirical perspectives, Cambridge. *Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* No. 3. 3–10.
- Coombs, W. T. (2010). Crisis communication. In R. Heath (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of public relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. No. 2. 477– 488.
- Dawley, S. (2013) Creating new paths? Offshore wind, policy activism, and peripheral region development. *Economic Geography*. Vol. 90, No. 1, 91-112.
- European Expert Group. (2012). Common European Guidelines on the Transition from Institutional to Community-based Care.
- Gečienė J. Raišienė A.G. (2019) Socialinės globos organizacijų atsparumo stiprinimo veiksniai. *Socialinė teorija, empirija, politika ir praktika*. vol. 19, 71–86.
- Genienė, R. ir Šumskienė, E. (2016). Stacionarios globos pertvarka Lietuvoje institucionalizmo teorijos požiūriu. *Socialinė teorija, empirija, politika ir praktika*, (12). 73-80.
- Kvieskienė G., Kvieska V., 2012, Socialinės partnerystės įtaka inovacijoms: monografija. Vilnius: Edukologija.
- Lukamskienė, V., Budėjienė, A. (2013). Socialinės paslaugos vyresnio amžiaus asmenims: savipagalbos ir socialinės globos aspektai. *Gerontologija*. 14(4). 228-234.
- Luthar S. S., Cicchetti D., Becker B. (2000) The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*. Vol. 71. 543–562.
- Ly, W., Wei, Y., Li, X., Lin, L. (2019). What Dimension of CSR Matters to Organizational Resilience? Evidence from China. *Sustainability. Business School, University of International Business and Economics*. Vol. 11. No. 6. 1 – 23.
- Magis, K. (2010). Community Resilience: An Indicator of Social Sustainability. *International Journal. Society & Natural Resources*. Vol. 23, No. 5. 401 – 416.
- Martin, R., Sunley, P. (2013). On the notion of regional economic resilience: conceptualisation and explanation. Submitted to *Journal of Economic Geography*. *Economic Geography*. Vol. 13, No. 20, 1 – 51.
- Norris, F., H., Susan, P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K., F., Pfefferbaum, R., L. (2008). Community Resilience as a Metaphor, Theory, Set of Capacities, and Strategy for Disaster Readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. Vol. 41, No. 2. 127–150.
- Pal, R., Torstensson, H., Mattila, H. (2014). Antecedents of organizational resilience in economic crises—an empirical study of Swedish textile and clothing SMEs. *Int J Prod Econ*. 147:410-428.
- Pike, A., Dawley, S., Tomaney, J. (2010). Resilience, adaptation and adaptability. Cambridge. *Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* No. 3. 59 – 70.
- Raipa, A. ir Petukienė, E. (2009). Klientų dalyvavimas viešosiose paslaugose: bendrasis paslaugų kūrimas. *Viešojo politika ir administravimas*, (27) 54-62.

- Rudolph, J.W., Repenning, N. (2002). Disaster dynamics: understanding the role of quantity in organizational collapse. *Journal Article*. Vol. 47, No. 1. 1 – 30.
- Swanstrom, T. (2008), *Regional Resilience: A Critical Examination of the Ecological Framework*. University of California Berkeley, Institute of Urban and Regional Development (IURD) Vol. 25, No. 07. 1 – 34.
- Utrecht University, Utrecht. 1 – 38.
- Večkienė, N.P., Budėjienė, A., Ražanauskienė, V., Ramanauskienė, K., Valiulis, A. (2013). Socialinis darbas senėjančioje visuomenėje: teoriniai ir praktiniai tarpdisciplininio bendradarbiavimo aspektai. *Gerontologija*, 14(3). 171-183.
- Williams, N., Vorley, T., Ketikidis, P., H. (2013) Economic resilience and entrepreneurship: A case study of the Thessaloniki City Region. *Journal Local economy*. Vol. 28, No. 4. 399 – 415.
- Wolfe, D.A. (2010), The strategic management of core cities: Path dependence and economic adjustment in resilient regions. *Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*. Vol. 3. 139–152.
- Zaccaro S.J. (2007). Traits based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*. Vol. 62, No. 1 6-16.